UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,110	04/10/2006	Ulrich Simon	288320US0PCT	9373

22850 7590 12/03/2009

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
DOLLINGER, MICHAEL M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1796	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/03/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see page 5 paragraph 3, filed 11/20/2009, with respect to the 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph rejection of claim 2, 7-13 and 15-17 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of 07/20/2009 has been withdrawn.

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/20/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that the claimed invention differs from Simon et al because the structure of the present invention has a feature that the reactive components present in the melt-adhesive structure react with crosslinking only in the melt. Applicants also argue that the activation temperature is lower than in previous systems and the structure has a good water resistance. These arguments are not convincing. These arguments have been presented in previous submissions to the office and were addressed in the previous non-final rejection. Examiners arguments are reiterated below.

3. Examiner notes that none of these limitations are recited in the claims. Additionally, these arguments are not persuasive because:

a. Simon et al. disclose that crosslinking occurs in the lower dot during drying and the upper dot during melting (column 4 lines 38-42). Drying occurs at 130°C (column 3 lines 64-66) and joining temperature occurs at 127°C (column 4 lines 9-11). All the starting materials melt at or below 120°C (column 55-64). There is no evidence that reaction occurs before melt in Simon et al.

b. As discussed in a), the activation temperature is at most 127°C. The activation temperature discussed in Applicant's specification is in a range from about 100 to 130°C (see page 3 lines 24-28). The activation temperature of Simon et al. appears to be the same as Applicant's activation temperature.

c. The base dot of Simon et al is dispersed in water (column 4 line 2) and the double dot structure is resistant to hydrolytic attack (column 4 lines 49-52) and henceforth the structure of Simon et al. has good water resistance.

4. Applicant's arguments filed 11/20/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that Hiratsuka et al disclose test strips that are used for blood examinations and large amount which are not manufactured by machines in large amounts. Applicants argue that the present invention is used in the garment industry and are manufacture by machine and must use small amounts of adhesive. This argument is not convincing. Applicants are arguing that if all of the features of Hiratsuka et al where incorporated, the result would not be suitable for the present invention. The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MIKE DOLLINGER whose telephone number is (571)270-5464. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/mmd/

/Randy Gulakowski/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796